Valerie Pacheco

As a Snoqualmie resident, I ask Ecology to prioritize community safety in the BESS PEIS and address the following:
Section 4, pages 16–19: Evaluate credible major incidents, including thermal runaway, explosions, prolonged fires, and reignition. Assess potential hazardous emissions affecting residents, schools, and responders, including how terrain and weather influence exposure.
Section 5.3, pages 20–21: Evaluate siting near homes, schools, forests, and waterways. Include seismic, flood, landslide, and wildfire risks, emergency access, evacuation routes, and evidence-based separation distances.
Section 5.4, pages 21–22: Study contaminated firefighting runoff, impacts to water and wildlife, and local emergency response capacity. Evaluate public notification, evacuation and shelter-in-place needs, monitoring, cleanup, and financial assurances. Assess whether safeguards remain effective during equipment failures or simultaneous emergencies.
Section 3.1.2.1, page 16, and Section 5.2, page 20: Examine gaps between adopted and newer safety standards, limitations of testing, and safety differences among battery technologies, including sodium-ion alternatives.
Sections 1.3–1.4, pages 11–12: Clearly identify uncertainties, impacts that cannot reliably be mitigated, and safety questions requiring project-specific review.
The public deserves clear findings that support safe siting and meaningful participation before individual projects proceed.